

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 14, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-27 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085132 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "Choi ") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,927,825 to Koma et al. (hereinafter "Koma"). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi and Koma and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,088 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "Choi '088"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi and Koma and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,759 to Kondoh (hereinafter "Kondoh"). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi and Koma and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0246388 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee '388"). Claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0169629 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee '629") and further in view of Koma. Claims 14, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi, Lee '629 and Koma and further in view of Choi '088. Claims 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi, Lee '629 and Koma and further in view of Lee '388. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi, Lee '629 and Koma and further in view of Kondoh. The rejection of claims 1-27 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "aligning the initially aligned FLC material, the aligning comprising: applying a first voltage to the common voltage terminal on the source PCB; applying a second voltage to the ground voltage terminal on the source PCB simultaneously with the first voltage to the common voltage terminal on the source PCB; applying the first voltage to the common voltage terminal formed on the gate PCB; and

applying the second voltage to the ground terminal formed on the gate PCB simultaneously with the first voltage to the common voltage terminal formed on the gate PCB.” None of the cited references including Choi and Koma, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner cites Koma for teaching this feature of the present invention.

Koma is directed to an optically compensated bend mode liquid crystal device in which a bend transition of the liquid crystal is secured. Nowhere does Koma mention ferroelectric electric liquid crystal material. The portion of Koma cited by the Examiner is directed to setting a common voltage so that when a transition voltage is applied, the liquid crystal can transition to a bend alignment state even if the transition voltage is not very high. This is completely different from aligning the initially aligned FLC material as called for in the present invention. The materials are different, the mechanisms are different, and the purposes are different. So Koma and Choi, singly or in combination, fail to teach this feature of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Choi and Koma for the same reasons as stated above. Further, Choi ‘088, Kondoh, and Lee ‘388, which are additionally cited, fail to cure the deficiencies of Choi and Koma. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 all are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23, and 26 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 13 and 16-18 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “aligning the initially aligned FLC material by applying a second voltage to a common electrode of the LCD panel, wherein the second voltage is different from the first voltage.” Claims 20, 22, 23, and 26 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a gamma circuit for generating a substantially uniform voltage independent of a gray scale value of a digital video data using the first voltage, wherein the first voltage is transmittable to the plurality of data lines via the data driving circuit upon an alignment of the initially aligned FLC material; and a common electrode driving circuit for applying the second voltage to the common electrode upon the alignment of the initially aligned FLC material.” None of the cited references including Choi, Lee ‘388, and Koma, singly or in

combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner cites Koma for teaching these features of the present invention.

The discussion above relating to Koma applies equally here as well, accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23, and 26 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, and 27 depend from claims 13 and 20 and are allowable over Choi, Lee '388, and Koma for the same reasons as stated above. Further, Choi '088, Kondoh, and Lee '629, which are additionally cited, fail to cure the deficiencies of Choi, Lee '388, and Koma. Accordingly, claims 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, and 27 and all are allowable over the cited references.


Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 12, 2005

By   
Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant